A/C.4
/48/
SR.27

READEX
FICHE

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL AND
DECOLONIZATION COMMITTEE
(FOURTH COMMITTEE)
27th meeting
held on
8 December 1993
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka)

CONTENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF FELIX HOUPHOUËT-BOIGNY, PRESIDENT OF CÔTE D'IVOIRE

AGENDA ITEM 85: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 86: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued)

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.4/48/SR.27
11 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82900 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF FELIX HOUPHOUËT-BOIGNY, PRESIDENT OF CÔTE D'IVOIRE

1. The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of all the members of the Committee, conveyed heartfelt condolences to the Government and people of Côte d'Ivoire and to the bereaved family on the death of Félix Houphouët-Boigny.

2. Mr. ABOUANOU (Côte d'Ivoire) thanked the Chairman for the expression of sympathy.

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence.

AGENDA ITEM 85: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/C.4/48/L.20, L.21-L.23, L.24/Rev.1, L.25, L.26/Rev.1, L.27-L.30, L.31/Rev.1 and L.36)

4. Mr. NOTERDAEME (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States and introducing draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.20, said that the signature of the Israeli-Palestinian accord at Washington on 13 September 1993 was an event of great importance for the future of the peoples of the Middle East that would finally clear the way for a definitive settlement of one of the most painful problems faced by the Palestinians, namely, the refugee question.

5. The European Union believed that it was the responsibility of the parties to establish the terms of the settlement through free negotiations and mutual agreement. The European Union and its member States were determined to continue playing an active, constructive and balanced role in advancing the peace process in general and the work of the multilateral group on refugees in particular.

6. The European Union believed that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) would continue to play a key role in improving social and economic conditions in the occupied territories during the period of transition towards Palestinian autonomy and the Agency's activities would remain of vital importance throughout its area of operations.

7. In the European Union's view, resolutions concerning UNRWA should reflect a pragmatic approach that would enable UNRWA to carry out its important humanitarian mission. He urged all Member States to continue and increase their support for the Agency, which was experiencing financial problems, so that it could continue to participate fully in efforts to bring peace and prosperity to the Palestine refugees in the Near East.

8. Ms. MINDERHOUD (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.21 on behalf of the sponsors, said that it commended the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA for its efforts to assist in ensuring the financial security of the Agency and requested it to continue its efforts for an additional year, in cooperation with the Secretary-General and the Commissioner-General. She hoped that the Committee, as in previous years, would adopt the draft resolution on the Working Group without a vote.

9. Mr. WIDE (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.22 on behalf of the sponsors, said that its purpose remained the same as that of corresponding resolutions in previous years, namely, to provide assistance to persons who had become displaced and needed assistance as a result of the hostilities of June 1967. In addition, the draft contained a strong appeal to all Governments, organizations and individuals to contribute generously to that end. He was confident the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus as in previous years.

10. Mr. SOEGARDA (Indonesia), introducing draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.23, L.24/Rev.1, L.25, L.26/Rev.1 and L.27 to L.31/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, said that UNRWA resolutions had always received the full support of the international community because the cause of the Palestine refugees was a just one and because the Agency had been doing excellent work over the years. The sponsors of the draft resolutions believed that the Agency's work had become still more important in the light of recent developments and certain revisions and amendments had been made in the draft resolutions in order to reflect the new realities.

11. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.23 dealt with grants and scholarships for Palestine refugees and draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.24/Rev.1 concerned the question of Palestine refugees in the Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.25 called for the resumption of the ration distribution to Palestine refugees in all fields. The sponsors would not insist on putting that draft resolution to a vote, on the understanding that the Agency and its Commissioner-General would respond positively within the limits of available resources if the need for ration distribution should arise. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.26/Rev.1 concerned the return of population and refugees displaced since 1967; it called upon Israel to accelerate the necessary steps for the unimpeded return of all displaced persons. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.27 dealt with the issue of revenues derived from the properties of Palestine refugees. After consultation with a number of parties, the sponsors had agreed to delete the word "administration" from the third line of paragraph 1 and to delete paragraph 4 completely. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.28 concerned the protection of Palestine refugees and called upon Israel to fulfil its obligation as the occupying Power in that regard in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.29 dealt with the proposed University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds" for Palestine refugees and draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.30 concerned the protection of Palestinian students and educational institutions and the security of UNRWA facilities in the occupied Palestinian territories. Lastly, draft resolution

(Mr. Soegarda, Indonesia)

A/C.4/48/L.31/Rev.1 concerned Palestine participation in the Advisory Commission of UNRWA. It authorized the Advisory Commission to invite the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the meetings and work of the Commission as an observer. He noted that the sponsors would not insist on putting draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.31/Rev.1 to a vote, on the understanding that the General Assembly, pending further action, would adopt a decision to request the Advisory Commission to establish a working relationship with the Palestine Liberation Organization. He expressed the hope of the sponsors that the draft resolutions would be adopted by the Committee and the General Assembly by the largest possible margin of support.

12. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to withdraw draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.36.

13. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.36 was withdrawn.

14. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee did not wish to take action on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.31/Rev.1. He also took it that the Committee wished to request the Advisory Commission of UNRWA to establish a working relationship with the Palestine Liberation Organization.

15. It was so decided.

16. Mr. DE SOUZA (Secretary of the Committee), speaking on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.21 concerning the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA, said that provision had already been made for substantive services for the Working Group under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1994-1995. Moreover, it had been assumed that the Working Group would hold 10 meetings in New York during 1994 and that those meetings could be serviced within the permanent capacity of the Office of Conference Services; therefore, no additional costs would arise and no additional appropriations would be required if the General Assembly should adopt draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.21.

17. With regard to draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.24/Rev.1, he said that, once again, the Secretary-General had been unable to comply with the request contained in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution to issue identification cards to Palestine refugees and their descendants. However, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.24/Rev.1, the Secretary-General would keep the situation under review in order to determine whether appropriate documentation regarding the registration status of individual members of refugee families could be issued.

18. With respect to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.29, he said that the Secretary-General continued to believe that a functional feasibility study on the proposed university would be required. Since it did not appear possible to complete such a study, the Secretary-General was not in a position to foresee related programme budget implications. However, should the situation change during 1994, the Secretary-General would

(Mr. De Souza)

propose to initiate such a study, which would be funded from accounts for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. Proposals for further action and related estimates would be put before the General Assembly during its forty-ninth session in the context of the report requested in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

19. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Comoros had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.22, L.23, L.24/Rev.1, L.25, L.26/Rev.1 and L.27 to L.30, Japan had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.21 and L.31/Rev.1, and Luxembourg and Germany had become sponsors of draft A/C.4/48/L.22. In addition, Bangladesh had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.21, L.23, L.25 and L.27 to L.30, Pakistan had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.25, and L.27 to L.30, and India had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.23, L.25, L.29 and L.31/Rev.1.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.20

20. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.20.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel, United States of America.

21. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.20 was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.21 and A/C.4/48/L.22

22. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolutions without a vote.

23. Draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.21 and A/C.4/48/L.22 were adopted without objection.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.23

24. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.23.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

25. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.23 was adopted by 139 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.24/Rev.1

26. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.24/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

27. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted by 135 votes to 2.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.25

28. The CHAIRMAN said he would take it that, as recommended by the representative of Indonesia in his introductory statement on behalf of the sponsors, the Committee agreed not to take action on the draft resolution.

29. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.26/Rev.1

30. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.26/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nigeria, Russian Federation, Samoa.

31. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.27

32. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.27.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

33. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.27 was adopted by 91 votes to 2, with 43 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.28

34. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.28.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia,

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Russian Federation.

35. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.28 was adopted by 134 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.29

36. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.29.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Russian Federation.

37. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.29 was adopted by 133 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.30

38. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.30.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

39. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.30 was adopted by 136 votes to 2.

40. Mrs. ZIKMUNDOVA (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that despite its full support for UNRWA the European Union thought it inadvisable to formulate unrealistic requests regarding the Commissioner-General, particularly in view of the precarious financial situation of the United Nations. It had therefore welcomed the decision by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.25 not to put it to the vote. The Commissioner-General could none the less distribute rations to refugees when necessary, if resources were available. She also welcomed the amendments that had been made to draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.26/Rev.1 and L.27.

41. Mr. GORDON (Israel) said that his country was in favour of assisting Palestine refugees and sympathized both with them and with non-refugees. The resolutions that had been adopted mostly ignored the new realities of the situation, however, which was why he had voted against draft resolutions A/C.4/48, L.24/Rev.1, L.26/Rev.1, L.27, L.28, L.29 and L.30 and had abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.20 and L.23. He added that his country had been happy to be part of the consensus in adopting draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.21 and L.22.

42. Mr. LOTFI HORMOZABADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that although he had voted for all the draft resolutions on which there had been a recorded vote he wished to express his reservations about those passages in the resolutions that might constitute recognition of Israel.

43. Mr. JELBAN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said the fact that his country had voted in favour of the resolutions in question did not in any way imply recognition of the occupying Power, although some phrases in the draft resolutions had seemed to give it legitimacy.

44. Mr. SUNDERLAND (Canada) said that the drafting of the resolutions on UNRWA reflected important developments in the peace process. Canada had therefore been able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.26/Rev.1 instead of abstaining, as it had done in previous years. He also welcomed the deferral of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.25: a reduction in the overall number of resolutions on UNRWA would make for a more constructive debate on the Agency's crucial mandate.

45. Ms. McKAY (Australia) said that although her country had voted in favour of most of the resolutions it was disappointed that many contained negative language and did not reflect the positive developments in the peace process. She hoped that future resolutions under agenda item 85 would reflect the profound changes stemming from the Declaration of Principles. She added, however, that there remained concern over acts which disrupted progress towards peace.

46. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) pointed out that the United States was UNRWA's largest donor and worked closely with it in the effort to support the Declaration of Principles. Historic commitments made by both sides in the Middle East peace process had changed the traditional approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict. The issue of Palestine refugees should be resolved by negotiation, although the United States also supported efforts to deal with existing aspects of the refugee situation. His country had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.20, since it wished to avoid issues or statements that divided and polarized. It opposed any language which could be considered as prejudging the outcome of negotiations. His country had supported draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.23, but with reservations concerning contributions to a proposed University of Jerusalem, "Al-Quds", which it did not endorse. It had voted against many of the resolutions concerning UNRWA because they were highly politicized, contained sweeping criticism of Israel's treatment of refugees or made proposals that were financially unsound. They served no practical purpose and he regretted that more had not been deferred, as draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.25 had been, or dropped altogether. His country had hoped for some rationalization of the many resolutions under agenda item 85. Rather than introducing outdated, contentious drafts, the international community should strive for the immediate alleviation of hardships, leaving the political goals to be pursued through the negotiating process.

47. Mr. SIDOROV (Russian Federation) said that his country had noted with satisfaction the positive developments in the Middle East peace process. The Declaration of Principles had brought about a new political and psychological climate, which should be warmly supported. It had led to a more constructive tone in the debate on UNRWA, whose work the Russian Federation fully supported. The Agency could do much to realize the provisions of the Declaration of Principles by providing economic and technical cooperation. Some of the draft resolutions had, however, departed from the humanitarian aspects of UNRWA's work. That applied particularly to draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.26/Rev.1, L.27, L.28 and L.29, which dealt with matters better left to the Arab-Israeli negotiations. His country had therefore abstained in the vote on those draft resolutions.

48. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, with regard to developments in the Middle East peace process, his delegation shared the position expressed by the Arab Foreign Ministers meeting at Cairo on 30 September 1993. It therefore wished to place on record its reservation concerning the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.20, which was not in keeping with that position.

49. Mr. AL-KIDWA (Observer for Palestine) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.20. However, his delegation regretted some of the changes in that draft resolution in comparison with the equivalent resolution in previous years.

AGENDA ITEM 86: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/C.4/48/L.32-L.35)

50. Mr. MORENO FERNANDEZ (Cuba), introducing draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.32, L.33, L.34, and L.35, said that the sponsors had made a great effort to revise the traditional resolutions under item 86 in order to reflect the recent changes in the Middle East, which they hoped would lead to a genuine and lasting peace. The six draft resolutions annually adopted on the question had been reduced to four shorter ones, which while introducing new language also retained important elements of principle that remained valid and needed reaffirmation.

51. With regard to draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.32, it was the view of the sponsors that the Special Committee had done commendable work and that its mandate should be extended until the human rights situation of the Palestinian people changed for the better. Reviewing the provisions of draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.33, L.34 and L.35, he said he hoped that, if consensus was not possible, they would be adopted with the broadest possible support.

52. Mr. ALAMUDDIN (Lebanon) said that he wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.35.

53. Mr. GORDON (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, observed that while the draft resolutions under item 86 had been somewhat modified, Israel believed that a more responsible and balanced approach should have been taken to the new reality being created in the region, so as to encourage the efforts to achieve peace. The draft texts, for instance, ignored the Declaration of Principles recently signed between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization and disregarded the understandings reached within its framework. Moreover, they touched on the subjects of boundaries, settlements and Jerusalem, whereas those issues should properly be discussed only in the negotiations stipulated in the Declaration of Principles. The United Nations had a responsibility to support that accord, which was an important step towards comprehensive peace and reconciliation in the entire region, but the draft resolutions under consideration contradicted its provisions and prejudged the outcome of the negotiations.

54. It should also be borne in mind that the Special Committee had been established in 1968 in an atmosphere of open hostility and total rejection of reconciliation. The Committee's mandate, as indicated by its very name, predetermined the outcome of its deliberations, was contrary to any notion of fair investigation, and was not in keeping with the prevailing spirit. Israel believed that the Special Committee should be disbanded and the resolutions submitted under agenda item 86 discontinued. It would vote against all the resolutions under the item and called upon other members to do the same.

55. Mr. SIDOROV (Russian Federation), noting that his Government condemned the violation of human rights in the occupied territories and any use of terrorist methods by extremist groups, said that the sponsors of the draft resolutions under consideration had done well to introduce references to the new political realities in the Middle East and to delete most of the confrontational elements of previous draft resolutions. Nevertheless, his delegation would abstain in the vote on all the draft resolutions under item 86 because they still contained confrontational appraisals regarding the use of violence and reasons for the instability in the Middle East, and because they dealt with issues of substance that were properly discussed only in the ongoing bilateral Arab-Israeli negotiations. Their consideration by the United Nations, whose role must be to promote the negotiations, would only serve to complicate them.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.32

56. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.32.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

57. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.32 was adopted by 81 votes to 2, with 52 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.33

58. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.33.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Central African Republic, Fiji, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Russian Federation, Samoa, United States of America.

59. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.33 was adopted by 130 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.34

60. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.34.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran

(Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

61. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.34 was adopted by 96 votes to 2, with 36 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.35

62. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.35.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

63. Draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.35 was adopted by 74 votes to 1, with 55 abstentions.

64. The CHAIRMAN invited members wishing to explain their vote after the voting to do so.

65. Mr. NOTERDAEME (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Union, said they welcomed the fact that the draft resolutions just adopted had been considerably improved over those of previous years and that there were fewer of them. They had, however, been unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.32 concerning the mandate of the Special Committee because they felt that both the structure and mission of that Committee should be rapidly changed to take due account of the new climate created by the peace process resulting from the signing of the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles, whose provisions should within the next few months considerably alter the daily life of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza.

66. It had also not been possible, in view of the current political context, for them to support draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.35 concerning the Golan Heights, despite their support for Security Council resolution 497 (1981). They had no reservations in principle, but felt that its language did not sufficiently reflect the positive changes set in motion by the peace process. They called upon Syria and Israel to continue their negotiations with a view to reaching a peace accord.

67. Mr. LOTFI HORMOZABADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions under agenda item 86, but wished to express reservations regarding any provisions therein which might be construed as a recognition of Israel.

68. Mr. SUNDERLAND (Canada) said that his delegation's positive vote on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.33 underlined Canada's commitment to the principle that the fourth Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War applied de jure to the territories under military occupation since 1967.

(Mr. Sunderland, Canada)

69. Canada recognized the considerable efforts made by the sponsors to improve many of the resolutions under agenda item 86. Despite significant improvements, however, it had abstained on draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.32 and L.34, because it believed they did not fully reflect the constructive, forward-looking approach required at the current critical moment in the peace process. Canada had changed its favourable vote to an abstention on draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.35 for similar reasons. Although based on legitimate interpretations of international law, the language and tone were inconsistent with the current engagement of regional parties in the peace process. Canada noted the important gestures made recently by the Syrian authorities on Israeli military personnel missing in action and on exit permits. It was actions such as those, demonstrating a forward-looking course, that would build confidence among the parties.

70. Mr. JELBAN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), referring to his delegation's positive vote on draft resolutions A/C.4/48/L.32 to L.35, said that it nevertheless wished to place on record its reservation with regard to all references to the recognition of Israel.

71. Ms. McKAY (Australia) said that despite the recent progress in the peace process, Australia remained concerned about the human rights situation in the occupied territories. It noted that the language of the resolutions had become more conciliatory and forward-looking, and that draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.32 recognized the importance of the peace process in resolving concerns about Israeli practices. It hoped that continuing progress in the peace process and the implementation of the Declaration of Principles would make it unnecessary to consider the resolutions currently under review at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

72. Australia understood that the language used in the texts concerning the occupied territories referred only to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, and that position also applied to any such references in resolutions considered under other items.

73. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that the situation surrounding the occupied territories had changed remarkably with the signing of the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles on 13 September 1993 at Washington. Similarly, the 14 September 1993 signing of the Jordan-Israel Common Agenda had established a framework for significant progress towards peace between those two countries. He congratulated the Israeli Government, the Jordanian Government and the Palestine Liberation Organization for demonstrating the will and determination to solve problems through negotiation. For its part, the United States remained committed to the goal of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement, achieved through direct negotiations based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

74. The United States had a strong interest in the human rights situation in the occupied territories. While its views on settlement activity were well known, it would be unproductive to debate the legalities of the issue. The

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

one-sided and outmoded language of the resolutions presented was divisive and did not contribute to the negotiations. His delegation found the resolutions to be more symbolic than helpful. It did take note, however, of the efforts made by the drafters to consolidate the draft resolutions, and it wished the number had been reduced even further. It also took note of the major improvements in resolution A/C.4/48/L.32, which had been changed from a resolution critical of Israeli practices across the board to a resolution authorizing the mandate of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices. However, it continued to believe that the Committee itself was biased and superfluous.

75. While his delegation had abstained in the vote on resolution A/C.4/48/L.33, it wished to point out particularly that it continued to believe that the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War was applicable to the occupied territories. Lastly, his delegation objected to references such as "occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem", and "Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem". That language might be considered as prejudging the outcome of negotiations. His delegation considered that those phrases described the territories demographically and geographically, were limited to territories occupied in 1967, and did not prejudge their status, which could only be resolved through negotiations.

76. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) expressed his delegation's reservation with regard to the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.34, for the same reason it had expressed earlier in connection with draft resolution A/C.4/48/L.20.

77. Mr. AL-KIDWA (Observer for Palestine) extended his delegation's thanks to all the Member States that had supported the draft resolutions adopted. The sponsors had made an exceptional effort to reconsider the usual draft resolutions in the light of the important political developments that had taken place in the region. In cooperation with the Arab Group and with other countries interested in the question, their efforts had focused on producing a group of resolutions that reflected positive developments while expressing a principled stand long upheld by the General Assembly on such items as the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to the occupied territories, which had been postponed in the negotiations between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

78. Certain explanations of vote had caused concern to his delegation. While the United Nations had a duty to provide full support for the peace process, it should also adhere to positions based on international law and correct moral and political values. His delegation would have liked to receive more support from certain countries with which it had had long discussions on the draft resolutions. However, it appreciated the positive results and remained ready to work with Member States to achieve further agreements leading towards peace in the region. He thanked the Chairman of the Special Committee, the Chairman of the Fourth Committee, and the members for their valuable work.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

79. The CHAIRMAN, after reviewing the work of the Committee's first session as the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee), announced that the Committee had completed its work for the forty-eighth session.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.